



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/873,879 | 05/29/2001 | Romain L. Billiet | | 5124 |

7590

02/13/2002

R. L. BILLIET
135A MALACCA STREET
PENANG, 10400
MALAYSIA

EXAMINER

TRAN, LEN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1725

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

A23

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/873,879 | BILLIET ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Len Tran | 1725 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2. 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 1a. Claims 13 and 14 recites the limitation "the mold article" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 4, 6-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Amaya et al (US 5,976,457).

disclose the method of

Amaya et al ^{disclose} the rapid and accurate method of producing a molding tools comprising the steps of providing a standard base mold (51), milling the pockets in the mold base, fabricating an interchangeable ceramic insert (50) having mounting surface matching the pockets, and securing the insert to the base pocket. The ceramic insert is produced by ceramic injection molding (figures 1-8) (col. 9, lines 39-42, lines 54-67, col. 10, lines 1-60). The method allows improved dimensional accuracy, reduction of surface texture inconsistency, mismatch the matching articles molded in different mold, geometry can be changed rapidly to different design, life of the molding tool is extended,

maintenance costs is reduced, and the interchangeable molded articles can be rapidly implemented in different geographical locations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amaya et al ('457) as applied to claim 1 above in paragraph 2, and further in view of Williamson et al (US 5,435,959).

Amaya et al disclose the claimed invention above, but fail to teach mold insert to be secured with an adapter or frame to the mold base.

However, Williamson et al disclose a screw (290) attach to a frame (284) securing onto a ceramic insert (288) to hold the insert in place.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made to provide a frame with securing means as taught by Williamson et al in order to secure the mold insert.

6. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amaya et al ('457) as applied to claim 1 above in paragraph 2, and further in view of Ruhle (US 5,199,482).

Amaya et al disclose the claimed invention above, but fail to teach a ceramic inset secured to the mold base by vacuum.

However, Ruhle discloses the method of holding the insert onto the base by vacuum.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made to provide vacuum means as taught by Ruhle, in Amaya et al to secure the ceramic insert.

7. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amaya et al ('457).

Amaya et al disclose the method of forming a molding tool, but fail to disclose the tool being a watch case, cellular phone, or buckles.

However, such design is capable in Amaya et al's method, since only the configuration of the mold insert would need to be changed and that Amaya et al's method allows one of ordinary skill in the art to rapidly change from one design to another.

Citation of Relevant Art

8. US 4,220,190, and JP 1-130838 are cited to show state of the art.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Len Tran whose telephone number is (703)605-1175.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on 703-308-3318. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)305-3602 for regular communications and (703)305-3602 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0661.

Len Tran
Examiner
Art Unit 1725

LT
February 1, 2002



M. ALEXANDRA ELVE
PRIMARY EXAMINER